



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,076	11/05/2003	Barbara Jane Wight	051481-5119	6307
9629	7590	03/07/2006	EXAMINER	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004				PARRIES, DRUM
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2836

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/701,076	WIGHT, BARBARA JANE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dru M. Parries	2836	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7, 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al. (5,964,815) and Starr (4,468,612). Wallace teaches a control system comprising a controller (38), a wiring harness (44), and a plurality of devices (12N) connected in series via the wiring harness to the controller. Wallace also teaches sequential electrical connection of the devices to the harness to increase the closed path of detected and identified devices (via programming and the normally open switches/ports). He also teaches that non-sequential connection opens the closed path and those devices can't be detected nor identified, and the devices are substantially identical (sensors, occupant restraint devices). Wallace goes on to teach the controller identifying the plurality of devices based on their proximity to the controller (identifies the first device first; the second device second, etc.) and incrementally expands the closed path to include the controller and however many devices have been identified. Wallace also teaches that feedback from the controller is used to recognize the plurality of devices (Col. 5, lines 50-53; Abstract; Col. 6, lines 28-37). Wallace fails to teach the wiring harness having a plurality of first and second couplings that attach each device to the harness. Starr teaches a wiring harness (171-174) with first (121-124) and second connectors (top of 111-114) that attach/detach devices to the harness. The second connectors are attached directly to electrical

components. Starr also teaches the connectors being substantially identical and having at least three electrical contacts arranged in a common pattern (101-107 & 131-137). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate first and second connectors between the wiring harness and the devices so that the devices can be removed and rearranged in the series system, if necessary, thereby giving the user more freedom in constructing the system.

3. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallace et al. (5,964,815), Starr (4,468,612), Keen et al. (6,988,670), and Farag et al. (2004/0014418). Wallace and Starr teach the control system described above. Wallace fails to teach the system being used for an HVAC system in a vehicle. Keen teaches a control system for an HVAC system in a vehicle. He teaches the HVAC system controlling the airflow and temperature in a vehicle via substantially identical actuators (Abstract). Keen is silent on where the airflow is being directed. Farag teaches an HVAC system in a vehicle that directs airflow to the footwell, interior vents, and windshield defroster ([0005]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Wallace's control system into an HVAC system for a vehicle so the different HVAC modules can be replaced and repaired easily and it's an efficient control system that would make any system work better (i.e. an HVAC system).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Huhn et al. (2003/0052180) who teaches an HVAC controller connected to devices via wiring harness and actuators.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dru M. Parries whose telephone number is (571) 272-8542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:00am to 5:00pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached on 571-272-2800 x 36. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DMP

2-28-2006



BRIAN SIRCUS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800